

### REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 20, 2006. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination, of which Claim 1 is the only claim in independent form. Claim 12 has been canceled, without prejudice, as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-11 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly and/or to improve matters of form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that Claims 2-7 and 9-11 would be allowable if rewritten in proper independent form. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully decline to so rewrite these claims.

In the Office Action states that the claims are restricted to one of the following inventions, and requires confirmation of a telephonic election of Group I:

Group I: Claims 1-11, drawn to a synchronization system where a reformatted input file is created by applying an updated algorithm to the input file and uploading the reformatted file to a host database, classified in class 707, subclass 201.

Group II: Claim 12, drawn to a clearinghouse database containing fund family data, classified in class 707, subclass 104.1.

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants hereby elect, without traverse, to proceed with prosecution of the claims of Group I (Claims 1-11) in the present application.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended Claim 1, as deemed necessary, with special attention to the points raised in section 3 of the Office Action.

Specifically, the phrase “assumed data values” has been changed to “test data values.”

This amendment is supported by the original disclosure at, for example, paragraphs [0008] and [0035] of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2005/0086193, which corresponds to the present application. Applicants submit that Claim 1 is sufficiently definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and therefore withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended Claim 8, as deemed necessary, with special attention to the points raised in section 3 of the Office Action. Specifically, the phrase “fictitious data ” has been changed to “test data.” This amendment is supported by the original disclosure at, for example, paragraphs [0035] and [0038] of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2005/0086193. Applicants submit that Claim 8 is sufficiently definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and therefore withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

No other claim rejections or objections are identified in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/  
Lock See Yu-Jahnes  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_Main 585129\_1